

**Draft Summary of Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
September 17, 2002**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Cultural Resources Work Group meeting on September 17, 2002 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary.

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	July 2002 Update
Attachment 4	August 2002 Update
Attachment 5	Proposition 40 Fact Sheet
Attachment 6	Proposition 40 Appropriation Plan
Attachment 7	Guidelines for the Development of Historic Properties Management Plans
Attachment 8	Collaborative Meeting Schedule

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the Cultural Resources Work Group meeting and objectives were discussed. The meeting agenda and a list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively.

Action Items – June 18, 2002 Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting

A summary of the June 18, 2002 Cultural Resources Work Group meeting is posted on the project web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

Action Item #C42: Distribute Work Group Updates for July and August 2002.
Status: Janis Offermann, DWR Resource Area Manager informed the participants that updates covering activities for July and August were distributed to the Cultural Resources Work Group participants via regular mail and she brought additional copies to the Work Group meeting for anyone that did not receive them. The updates are included as Attachments 3 and 4, respectively to this summary.

Carry Over Action Item:

Action Item #C40: Research Information on possible Proposition 40 funding for activities at Oroville.
Status: Janis Offermann explained that money might be available for projects in the Oroville area however applications for funding are not being accepted at this time. She distributed a fact sheet and a summary of Proposition 40 project commitments. These documents are included as Attachments 5 and 6, respectively to this summary.

Cumulative Effects Analysis Update

Steve Heipel reminded the participants of an earlier presentation introducing the cumulative impacts analysis process, and of the guidance document distributed at that time concerning cumulative impact analysis. Steve further explained generally how cumulative impacts are evaluated, and how they can be understood in the context of this project. He explained that cultural resource cumulative impacts would be analyzed based on existing information. He reviewed the collaborative's schedule for the development of project alternatives, criteria for

determining significant impacts, and the cumulative impact analysis. He explained that this analysis is not time-critical right now but rather an iterative process that will continue throughout development of the environmental document.

Study Plan Implementation Update

Helen McCarthy, ethnographer with the consulting team, reviewed progress made with the ethnographic portion of Study Plan C1. She reported that the ethnographer trainees have been reviewing archival materials, developing a database, and are starting the individual interview process. She explained that the team is utilizing resources at local libraries as well as the State Archives and the trainees have been doing a great job in assisting the consultants. Ellen Clark with Department of Parks and Recreation indicated that she would like to suggest individuals that the team may wish to add to the list of interviewees and that she would get those to Helen.

Janis Offermann informed the participants that the Cultural Resource Inventory Work Plan has been completed and she brought a few copies for those that would like to see it. She indicated that it is also available for review at the Oroville Cultural Resources office for those that are interested. The Facilitator observed that the completion and availability of the research design document answers one of the questions included in an e-mail sent to her by Leslie Steidl. She explained that Leslie apologized for not being able to attend the meeting today but requested a number of questions be posed to the Work Group in her absence. The questions and answers given are as follows:

Q: Has an APE been established and is there a map?

A: The APE established to date in the process is the existing FERC Project Boundary and a map of that boundary is available. If through the process, changes need to be made to that baseline APE, for example, if proposed new facilities require changes to the FERC Project Boundary, then the APE will be adjusted to reflect that change and a new map created. Frank Winchell with FERC added that the APE is considered dynamic and adjustable if necessary throughout the process.

Q: Has the confusing ownership of the federal parcels around the lake been established?

A: Federal and state ownership around the lake continues to be refined with field survey crews establishing more accurate lines where questions arise. That information is currently being fed into the GIS database and could be produced graphically as a layer of Project information.

Q: What is the status of the research design that is directing the inventory? Is a copy of this research design available?

A: As indicated above, the research design is complete and copies are available.

Mark Selverston with the consulting team reviewed the progress of fieldwork associated with Study Plan C1. He presented a slide show documenting the training effort and field activities that have been conducted from both land and water access. He indicated that the fieldwork season is approximately two-thirds complete. He reported that with approximately 8 weeks left in this field season, 472 sites have been recorded. Most of these are newly recorded and historic in nature. The historic artifacts are being dated by visual inspection while some of the prehistoric artifacts could be dated later, although he stressed that very little is actually being collected at this time. He anticipated more prehistoric sites would be identified within the fluctuation zone as the reservoir level lowers in the fall.

Maidu Advisory Council Update

Patty Reese-Allen provided an update on the Maidu Advisory Council activities. She reported that the fluctuation zone survey was underway and that protocols were being developed for the handling of artifacts. She reported on the Maidu Advisory Council's visit to the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) West Sacramento storage facility and indicated that the visit did not meet their expectations. Another trip will be scheduled in the near future. She added that DPR agreed to develop a list of Maidu artifacts currently being stored at their facility.

Management Plan Introduction and Discussion

Frank Winchell from FERC reviewed key points of the Historic Properties Management Plan development process. He explained that the Plan should incorporate efforts and strategies to manage cultural resources for the next FERC license term. He acknowledged that there are a number of ways to proceed, and suggested the collaborative might review what he considers to be good examples of management plans that have been recently developed for other hydropower licenses such as Hat Creek, Mokelumne, Cowlitz, Middle Snake (Idaho Power) and Chelan County's latest filing. He suggested that the Plan developed for the Cowlitz Project effectively incorporates the 'historic district' concept and may be an appropriate one to review in preparation for developing Oroville's Management Plan.

Steve Heipel reviewed the Guidelines for the Development of Historic Properties Management Plans (Attachment 7), and explained that the plan needs to be drafted in such a way that is neither too open ended, nor too restricting but rather provides some flexibility for a multi-decade approach. Frank added that there is a 5-year built in review process, 2002 to 2007 when a new license is issued, that makes the Management Plan a flexible document. Steve also distributed example sections of a Historic Properties Treatment Plan. He reviewed some standards that will be covered in the Management Plan, but reminded the participants that the details are not yet known.

Next Meeting and Next Steps

The Facilitator asked the participants if the recent meeting format where the Work Group meets less than monthly but provides monthly updates on activities is acceptable. The participants agreed that it was not necessary at this time to meet every month and the summaries were adequate however they would like to keep the meeting dates scheduled in the event a monthly meeting is warranted. The Facilitator distributed a new monthly meeting schedule showing Plenary and work group meetings scheduled until July 2003 (Attachment 8) and proposed the next Cultural Resources Work Group meeting be held on November 12, 2002. The group concurred. The next Cultural Resources Work Group meeting will be:

Date: November 12, 2002
Time: 5:30 – 8:30 p.m.
Location: To be determined

Action Items

The following list of action items identified by the Cultural Resources Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and due date.

Action Item #C43: Distribute Work Group summary for October.
Responsible: DWR Staff
Due Date: October 31, 2002